

Davis Politics 1971-72

Dynamics of an Incipient Social Movement

Carol M. Dixon

*Paper Number 4
The Papers in Davis History Series
The Davis Historical Society
Davis, California
2006*

The Papers on Davis History Series

The purposes of the *Papers on Davis History Series* are to publish article-length original research studies, data compilations, and photographic collections on aspects of the history of Davis, California.

Initially, publication will be electronic by means of the Society's web site. In time, there may also be print versions.

Anyone who has compiled a photographic montage or data assemblage or has completed a research article on Davis history is encouraged to submit it to the DHS Publications Committee to be considered for publication in the series. Details are available on the Publications Committee Folder at www.davishistoricalsociety.org

Papers in the Series

1. *A Minimal Traditional House: 647 G Street, Davis*. Tanya Lieberman, 2003.
2. *Pre-WWII Views of North Davis: Pictures from Lofland and Haig, Davis, CA, 1910s- 40s*. John Lofland, 2003.
3. *Nineteenth Century Davis, California Buildings Still Standing in 2003*. Merrily DuPree, 2003.
4. *Davis Politics 1971-72: Dynamics of an Incipient Social Movement*. Carol M. Dixon, 2006.
5. *A 1920s-50s Student District in Davis, California*. John Lofland, 2006.
6. *The Henry Stalling Family of Davisville—A Desbach-Hunt-Boyer Mansion Family*. Valerie Vann, 2006.

Contents

Context Introduction	John Lofland	4
Editorial Introduction	Lyn H. Lofland	6
Davis Politics 1971-72: Dynamics of an Incipient Social Movement		7
Setting and Methods		7
I. Wide-Angle Lens: Formulating the Issue		7
<i>Appointed Groups</i>		8
<i>Established Groups</i>		10
<i>New Groups</i>		12
<i>Opposition</i>		14
<i>Role of the Newspaper</i>		15
<i>Focusing on Political Action as a Channel for Goals</i>		15
II. Zoom Lens: Dissecting an Action Group		16
<i>Phase One: Discovering Interests that Imply Action</i>		16
<i>Phase Two: Initiating and Planning</i>		17
<i>Phase Three: Becoming Public</i>		21
<i>Phase Four: Becoming a Formal Group</i>		26
III. Wide-Angle Lens: Channeling Action		32
<i>Appointed Groups</i>		33
<i>Established Groups</i>		34
<i>New Groups</i>		35
<i>Greater Davis Campaign Activity</i>		38
<i>Opposition</i>		40
<i>Results</i>		46
Notes		41
Bibliography		46

Context Introduction John Lofland

In this paper Carol Dixon makes key contributions to our knowledge of Davis history as well as to our understanding of political action. These contributions arise from a uniquely fortunate but unplanned and unintended intersection of her biography and the “biography” of Davis.

In the Fall of 1971, Ms. Dixon entered her third year of graduate study in sociology at UC, Davis. She was 24 years old and a 1969 graduate of St. Olaf College, a first-rate liberal arts institution in Northfield, Minnesota.

That same Fall, it would have been difficult to predict that the Davis City Council election scheduled for April 11, 1972 would be a turning point in that town’s history. But it was and an event subsequently celebrated as the “revolution of ’72.” Some two decades of innovative growth control, environmental, and other policies ensued. Although now long faded, that “progressive” era nonetheless continues to frame conceptions of Davis and Davis history itself.

This is to say that Davis’ “biography” experienced a radical turning point in 1972. Events leading up to that change are therefore of more than ordinary interest—as they are for all great turning points. But, being rare and unpredictable, we are usually caught unprepared to observe them. The consequence is poor documentation of many important human events.

Students of Davis history have, indeed, presumed there was little or no documentation of the 1971-72 period. But this presumption is, fortunately, incorrect. It is incorrect because the biographies of Ms. Dixon and Davis intersected. In the Fall, Winter and Spring of 1971-72 she was a participant in a group of Davis political activists called the Greater Davis Research and Planning Group and its encompassing milieu. A student named Bob Black was a leading figure in that milieu and he was one of the three new progressive era candidates elected on April 11, 1972.

Dixon “hung out” in that political milieu and she did two additional things that set her participation off from that of everyone else there at the time. One, she took notes and otherwise kept records, such as collecting newspaper stories and the documents produced by various groups. Two, she strove to make sense of what she was seeing in terms of concepts that revealed form and order in the raw data. The story she tells in this paper is engaging and convincing in important part because she worked *at the time* to get the facts down and because she devised and applied a set of ideas about group problem-solving.

Why did she go to all that trouble? The answer is that, during the 1971-72 academic year, she was enrolled in a graduate field observation course. One element of that training was a practicum in which each student selected a field situation, observed it and/or interviewed on it, and wrote a paper. Scouting the Davis scene, her decision was to join what became known as the Greater Davis Research and Planning Group.

The field methods course in which she did the research was small (half a dozen students), met once a week for three hours, and was organized as a seminar. After some three months of readings on and discussions of how to do field studies, each student’s then on-going project was a focus of several seminar presentations and discussions over the Winter and Spring terms. In addition, the professor conducting the seminar—me—reviewed and made suggestions on field notes and on drafts of reports. This is to say that Dixon and her fellow students were not doing their studies alone. Seminar members had detailed knowledge of one another’s projects and were mutually supportive colleagues. In recent jargon, she was a member of a researcher “support group.”

In social science field studies, important attention is given to the “fit” between the observer and those observed. In this case, Dixon was physically smaller than and younger than (and looked younger than) the main people she was observing. These features combined with her politeness, cordiality, and middle class demeanor. This “persona” encouraged Greater Davis members (and others) to be solicitous of her and to explain things to her (to lecture her, actually). Such benign patronizing nicely dovetailed with her desire to collect information.

In fieldwork jargon, Dixon was an “unknown observer,” that is, she mostly “passed” as a member rather than identifying herself as a sociological researcher and obtaining what is called “informed consent.” Such passing to do research was still common in 1971 and it was almost a taken-for-granted practice. Not many years later, however, this changed. While some researchers still “pass,” it has become exceedingly problematic in graduate sociology training programs and in general. So, Dixon’s study is one of the last of its kind.

My experience in trying to teach sociology has led me to think that seeing the world sociologically is much easier and more natural and spontaneous for some people than for others. Indeed, I have concluded that while anyone can do sociology, it is “natural” and skillful for relatively few people. In this way, it is not unlike gifts (or lack of them) for other fields, like music.

Carol Dixon is, in my experience, one of the rare few with a gift for sociology. Notice that an exquisitely detailed and insightful conceptual framework organizes her report. While she was inspired and informed by sociological frameworks of the early 1970s, the analysis she presents is not lifted from someone else and applied. Instead, she invented it to make sense of her data. Even after three decades, it remains informative and one could well argue that social movement studies have yet to catch up.

But as among people with other special gifts, just because you are exceptionally good at something and a “natural” does not mean you want to dedicate your life to it. Such was her decision. She concluded her sociological career with a UC Davis M. A. and Cd. Phil. and pursued other interests. Today, she is the Registrar of Trinity Lutheran Seminary in Columbus, Ohio.

This report is her enduring gift to us, students of the history of Davis, California, in particular, and of political action, more generally.

Regarding both these topics, let me conclude by indicating what is, to me, Dixon’s most important finding. In the Davis case and in other cases, when viewed in broad, historical perspective political action seems often to have clear and strong causes and even to be inevitable. But, *also*, when that same action is seen up-close at the time it can appear quite *fragile, tentative, and problematic*.

From the perspective of later decades, the Davis “Revolution of ‘72” is predictable, “natural” and even necessary. Population growth, demographic shifts, political and environmental crises of the Sixties, and other changes “foreordained” the Davis progressive era that crystallized on April 11, 1972. Such an analysis is entirely familiar and the bread and butter of the socio-political causal paradigm.

But, *seen from below at the time*—the land into which Dixon takes us—nothing is foreordained or inevitable. Bob Black and his friends were groping along and were highly uncertain of their every action. Black himself could easily not have run for the City Council. The “Greater Davis” group was as much fiction as fact. Senses of purposes were conflicted and shifting. Acting together on most anything was highly problematic.

This contrast between how political action appears from above in historical perspective versus from below at the time provides us a final lesson. It is a lesson the Greater Davis folks seemed keenly to sense:

Not certain what to do or if any action will make any difference, one embraces *some* action and does *something* anyway.

Editorial Introduction Lyn H. Lofland

Carol Dixon's paper was written to fulfill a seminar requirement and the seminar was offered in a Department of Sociology. Those two facts mean that some changes were necessary to make it an appropriate addition to the Papers in Davis History series. Additionally, it was written in the early years of the 1970s and that fact required a decision on whether to change some of the language to conform with early 21st century conventions. Let me explain the editorial changes and the language decision I made regarding these matters.

First, since the author did not have publication in mind, the paper was never subjected to the copy-editing work that is always necessary if first drafts are to be transformed into journal articles and books. In this instance, the first draft was remarkably well written and as such, not a great deal of transformation was called for. The changes that I deemed necessary had mostly to do with correcting punctuation and spelling, with occasional additions or rearrangements of words to increase clarity, and with clearly identifying (thanks to the author's memory) the data source (field notes vs interviews) for most of the many extracts.

Second, having been written for a sociology seminar, the original paper naturally followed sociological practice regarding identification of the persons one is writing about: except for public figures (and in some cases, even then), participants are either given pseudonyms or only initials or first names are used. In fact, had Carol, at the time, aimed for a publication, she would likely have disguised the identities not only of most of the participants, but of the public figures, the location of the research, and possibly even the years as well. Fortunately for us, her "disguises" are minimal. We know exactly where and when this all took place and we know the real names of that portion of the cast of characters who were political candidates, members of the City Council and Planning Commission, or other public figures. For the rest, Carol bequeathed us real first names. My task, then, in attempting to turn a work of sociology into a work of history, was to fully identify as many of these first-named people as I could. Thanks to some of the sources Carol herself used (e.g., *Davis Enterprises* of the period), this was easier than I expected and only a few individuals now remain in a semi-anonymous state; that is, continue to exist in the text as first names only. There is also a smaller number for whom the identification is, at best, an educated guess and since the level of certainty here is not very high, I have signaled that fact with a question mark in brackets. Finally I should note that there are some people who appear so frequently and are so central to the story Carol is telling (e.g., Valerie Anderson and Jon Hammond), that the continued use of first and last names began to seem redundant and in the later sections of the paper, the second identifier is simply dropped.

Third, sociological writing (in fact most writing) in the early 1970s routinely used man or men to stand for males and females (e.g., Mrs. Jones, the chairman of the group), a practice that by the next decade was under significant challenge and that today, has largely disappeared. I could easily have modernized such language but chose not to do so on the grounds that the document should accurately reflect the period in which it was written. I trust readers will not be offended by this decision.

Davis Politics 1971-72

*Dynamics of an Incipient Social Movement**

One of the more common ways of analyzing a social movement is in terms of its natural history: the phases or stages through which it passes on its way to becoming (if completely successful) institutionalized. The usual procedure has been to study retrospectively a publicly successful, mature movement; thus analysis of the amorphous beginning of a movement must be done *ex post facto* from those movements which survived their tender beginnings. A danger inherent in this approach is that the beginnings, seen in retrospect, become too cut-and-dried. The problematic of organization, strategies, goals, even the sheer existence of the movement, are underemphasized. Models of social movement development also often underemphasize the variety of groups that may be involved. The implication seems to be that one founding group (often with a charismatic leader) was responsible for the growth of the entire movement, which need not be the case.

The strategy in this paper, then, is to concentrate on the dynamics of a beginning social movement, one whose ultimate destiny, in fact, is still undecided. This is a procedure which allows (even forces) the investigator to be aware of the many uncertainties present in the inception and growth of a social movement. The perspective in Part One will be a wide-angle one, scanning the various groups in the community as they become involved to a greater or lesser extent in the formation of an issue and begin to focus on a specific channel of activity. Then, using a zoom lens in Part Two, a specific group involved in this incipient social movement will be analyzed at close range as an example of the kinds of problematics involved in the formation and development of an action group. Part Three returns to the wide-angle view of the social movement as a whole, to explicate the tactics and results of the specific action channel chosen in Part One. Part Four [not included here] is a brief discussion of the implications of this research for social movement models.

SETTING AND METHODS

The incorporated city of Davis is a University town of about 25,000¹ situated in the middle of Class I agricultural land. Its most salient characteristic, in terms of this paper, is its recent rapid growth. Development jumped from nine million dollars worth of building permits in 1970 to twice that amount in 1971.² In 1971, the City approved over 6,000 new units to house an estimated total of 18,671 potential new residents.³

I worked as a participant observer in the Greater Davis Research and Planning Group, a local ecology action group, for a period of six months. I also attended City Council and Planning Commission meetings and other local group meetings; participated in the City Council campaign; followed events in the local and campus newspapers; and informally and formally interviewed key people.

I. WIDE-ANGLE LENS: FORMULATING THE ISSUE

Theodore Abel, in discussing the conditions under which a social movement will materialize, sees as basic the development of both an ideology, directed toward some goal, and an issue,

directed against something.⁴ In Davis, the ideology, which appeals to some ideal state, was that of environmental concern, ecological quality, and (probably most all-embracing) the image of what a community should be. The idea of a "valued small-town atmosphere" became linked with ecological-environmental concerns, and was seen as the positive side of the anti-growth campaign. The consequences of rapid growth created the issue. Although various groups became involved or were forced to combat different consequences of growth, most found a common source to blame, that of the current City Council.

A social movement, especially in its formative stages, may be comprised of many small, organized or disorganized, long-range or short-term, formal or informal groups that may have very little, if any direct communication links connecting them.⁵ As more people became aware of the consequences of Davis' growth, three different types of groups became involved in focusing on growth as an issue.

APPOINTED GROUPS

Certain appointed groups, which included consideration of what a community should be within their definition of purpose, began to define their activities in terms of the issue of growth.⁶

The *Davis Planning Commission* is a seven-member citizens group appointed by the City Council whose decisions can be overruled by the Council. They deal with zoning ordinances, development and business location requests, and other decisions based on whether a planned building will conform to the Davis general plan. As the unprecedented growth of Davis continued, development requests took up more and more of the commissioners' time, leaving them with very little time to consider unified planning instead of piecemeal decisions.

[field note]

Lois O'Brien was talking about how approval for building subdivisions goes through almost by default. . .she gets these requests on Thursday, maybe five or six of them, she spends the whole weekend running around looking at sites, getting maps and checking it; there just isn't time to get all the information needed to make a decision by Tuesday night.

* * *

"I am impressed by the lack of planning the Planning Commission is doing," commented Planning Commissioner Gerald Adler last January 19. . . . the Commissioners that very night were formulating their resolve to review the General Plan.⁷

In subsequent meetings, the Commission gradually worked out its stance toward growth. (1) In February, Adler proposed that the Commission base its decisions on the principle of internally generated growth only (i.e., no speculative housing). McKeon's request for 350 townhouses on Covell and Pole Line was denied; eventually it was cut to 193 townhouses.

(2) At City Council budget hearings in the spring, the Commissioners requested that the City hire an associate planner; they felt that more planning staff was necessary to conduct a thorough review of the general plan. Refused then, they re-opened the debate in October at a joint meeting

with the City Council, where a 3-2 Council majority expressed lack of support for the idea. The next week, however, the Commission reiterated its request in Commissioner John Bukey's motion which passed 5-2. His motion asked that the Council provide adequate funds for a complete review of the general plan; that they hire an additional staff member by December 1971; and that they appoint a citizens' committee to assist in the review.

(3) As mentioned, the Planning Commission and City Council had approved over 6,000 units for a possible growth of 18,000 new residents. Although not all of these approved units would necessarily be built, the zoning ordinance stated that the City may have land ready for development no more than five years in advance of potential needs. The Commissioners resolved that a potential of 18,000 people was "clearly in excess" of future needs. They renewed their commitment to review the general plan and its "growth" implications.

(4) At the October meeting, Adler proposed a one-year moratorium on all development in the city's outskirts⁸ so that the Commission could work entirely on a review of the general plan. The session was adjourned before the moratorium could be voted on: if Chairman [Robert] Warren had not gaveled the meeting closed (calling the proposal "damn near criminal"), Adler had enough support at that point that his motion probably would have passed, although not necessarily unanimously.

(5) In the special meeting a week later, the Commission unanimously substituted (after negotiation) a policy to "discourage major development applications while the general plan is being reviewed by the Commission." (The City Council would have overruled the moratorium proposal anyway.) The "discourage" policy was clarified in subsequent meetings to mean that the planning staff would not assist in preparation and the Planning Commission would not review annexation, rezoning, and tentative or final planned development requests unless the developers could clearly prove that their developments were "in the public interest."⁹ The presumption of the public interest test was that further development was not in the public interest.

(6) The Commission voted to meet weekly from November on. The first meeting would be the regular public meeting and the other three would be work on the general plan. In their discussions of the general plan review, the commissioners voiced their concern with growth as a major issue in a plan overhaul.¹⁰ (The plan was last revised in 1964.)

[field note]

Lois O'Brien: . . . ought to work out community goals and Guidelines . . .
the current plan doesn't work out the question of growth per se or just internally
generated growth. John Williamson: things have changed even
in the years since the general plan was reviewed, new questions involve open
space, conservation of land . . . every new person we provide for we do at the
expense of agricultural land, the best in the world; we need to state our
priorities (such as low density vs. preserve land) . . . on these things we
should state in the plan specifically that we have a definite aye or a definite
nay or a definite vaguely (chuckles from group).

They again called for the formation of a citizens' committee to help in the review of the general plan. After two months [of] negotiations, the Planning Commission and the City Council agreed on the size and role of this citizens' committee.¹¹

The *Citizens Committee* was appointed by the Council in January, 1972 to "study various elements of the current City general plan and make recommendations for updating it"¹² to the Planning Commission, along with minority reports.

Consisting of 100 members, the committee was divided into ten subcommittees, dealing with areas such as recreation and parks, open space, housing, and so on. Again the ideological concern was with what a community should be, and in their deliberations the various subcommittees concerned themselves with the issue of growth, even where their area of concern might not necessarily be so direct. (A subcommittee such as "open space" almost had to deal with the implications of growth, but other committees, which might not be so directly concerned, also seemed to be treating it as central rather than peripheral.)

The Community Design Subcommittee decided 8-1 against assumption number 3 in the current general plan that the percentage of Sacramento commuters will increase They accepted the assumption that large residential development in Solano county would be bad for Davis. . . . The committee withheld action on one of the plan's primary assumptions which holds that there should be 90,000 people by 1990.¹³

Other subcommittees, too, were querying the population projections of Davis's current plan. In response to requests from subcommittee chairmen, Planning Director Michael Foley announced that probably "there will be a survey of the entire community on its attitudes about the future of Davis."¹⁴

ESTABLISHED GROUPS

Besides these appointed groups that had as their major impetus the issue of growth, certain established groups in Davis, formed for more general purposes, began to take an interest in the "community" ideology and growth issue. These types of groups, Maurice Pinard argues, may be important in the processes of recruitment to a beginning social movement. Whether they are positive, negative, or neutral about the new movement, they are "excellent channels of communication, transmitting information about new ideas and practices"¹⁵ so that members are more likely to learn about the new movement.

Clamor Club was one of these communication channels. Begun in 1964, it was a community forum sponsored by the Davis Area Chamber of Commerce, but the Chamber "is not responsible for anything said at the meetings." It met downtown once a week at noon to discuss questions, often controversial, pertaining to Davis. One of its topics in October 1971 was "to grow or not to grow" and discussion was spirited. The image of "community" was nostalgically presented:

[field note]

Bob Black: . . . question of how big a town can grow, or how small it can stay, to be a nice place to live . . . quality of life has radically changed

since I came in 1965, "most of the old virtues have gone by the boards"

Chuck Lindner: Yeah, Frosty Queen was right across the street from the Bank of America. . . there's an assumption that Davis must grow -- we should be more skeptical about its inevitability.

Jon Hammond: Davis should start preserving the agricultural land under its stewardship.

Howard Reese (city manager): we must face the probability that the Yolo county supervisors will allow development outside the city boundaries if we don't expand them. . . [we] have to annex just to have some control over "how the seeds of growth develop."

John Simmons (real estate): developers are only keeping up with the demand, not creating it. . . .

Sam Harrison (real estate): yeah, no developer has made a killing by wooing all those mythical Sacramentans to Davis bedrooms.

Person Unknown: Ha, houses are to population growth as freeways are to car increases.

The *Davis Improvement Association*, a University-oriented group with selective membership criteria, usually met monthly to discuss current City issues or hear prominent local speakers. It publicly supported Adler's moratorium proposal in October. In December, the Association held an open meeting, public invited, to discuss the implications of the general plan review. A panel consisted of professional planners for Yolo County, Woodland, Davis, and the Sacramento Regional Area Planning Commission. Again, growth became the main topic of discussion.

The Yolo County planner agreed that if the County's idea of Davis' future size came out higher than Davis' idea of its optimum size, the County might approve development outside the City. Since, however, the Davis plan estimate was now 20-25,000 higher than the County's estimate, Davis could safely reduce itself by that much. The Regional planner also supported a smaller Davis plan.

Audience discussion brought out two more points on growth. Adler reiterated the principle of accommodating internally generated growth only, with any new "growth generators" required to justify themselves before being accepted. Dr. Stuart [?] Peoples Professor of Pharmacology [?], on the other hand, pointed out that size restrictions would raise land prices and "Davis would become even more of an elitist community than it is now."¹⁶

The League of Women Voters, another established group, was basically a study group. It investigated current local, state, and national issues. Informal study meetings were held twice a month in members' homes with hostesses acting as resource personnel and moderators. The local topic chosen in January, 1972 was "the Davis General plan and the future of our community."

These study meetings led to the consensus agreement that the general plan should state as a goal that

the present character and identity of Davis as a separate community be preserved.
The majority supported orderly and planned growth for Davis that is

internally generated by employers presently located in the community or by the needs of the Davis residents . . . it is opposed to large developments which do not meet Davis' needs and which would market Davis elsewhere We do not want Davis to sprawl, for such disorderly growth would waste valuable agricultural land, increase the costs of City services, and lessen our sense of community.¹⁷

NEW GROUPS

New interest groups were also formed to deal with the issue of growth. One group (eventually named the Northwest Davis Neighborhood Association) formed, for example, when UCD professor and developer Julian Youmans completed a 92-unit apartment complex with a three-story observation tower located across Drake Drive from a row of single-family dwellings. Besides exacerbating the problems of traffic flow and parking, the development infringed on residents' privacy, since the tower allowed views into their front windows and fenced-off back yards.

The residents presented a petition to the City Council in October, asking that the offending south wall of the tower be made solid and that the apartment parking lot entrances on Drake Drive be closed off and new ones cut onto Covell Boulevard. For the next two weeks, City Manager Howard Reese and his staff attempted to mediate between the protesting residents, the apartment complex owner, and the owner of the land. At the two-hour public hearing held at the end of October 1971, residents reiterated their original demands. The Council, indicating that it was essentially powerless since the apartments had already been approved by the city, requested instead that Youmans put tinted glass windows in the observation tower and dedicate land to the City to build a parking lot entrance connected to Anderson Road. These "admittedly stop gap solutions" did not appease the residents, as is clear from an angry letter to the editor by two of those present at the meeting.

We must congratulate the council on its performance. The parts they Played . . . were played to the hilt . . . our Mayor [Vigfus Asmudson] played the go-between, not the joker or the real good guy. HE WAS JUST SORRY, SORRY for the situation. He admitted it was a bad one, but what could we do . . . surely he couldn't ask the developer to do that now that it was already built . . . [Michael] Foley also had a bit part as the Planning Director who didn't know how many parking spaces were required per apt . . . Since the Planning Director doesn't know, the mayor should have asked the developers Yes, the people knew that it was zoned apartments, but they also knew this city had planners. They felt the planners would see the problems that would arise from putting a 92 unit apartment house on an almost cul-de-Sac. They thought also the planners would do their job by good planning. GOOD FOR EVERYONE NOT ONLY THE DEVELOPERS As citizens of Davis and taxpayers at that, we are getting tired of the same old performance by the City Council We will remember this when we go to the polls in April and hope other concerned citizens in Davis will do likewise.¹⁸

In November, the protesters announced the formation of the Northwest Davis Neighborhood Association. As one of the spokesmen explained, ". . . a formal residential organization would give some leverage to their demands, since as individuals they are not as effective as large groups."¹⁹

The *Citizens' Committee for Oxford Circle Open Space* began in the spring of 1971 when a group of students living in the area became concerned over lack of parking space and lack of any sort of park or recreational area ("hardly enough to play Frisbee!"). The Oxford Circle area is a high-density apartment district in which over 3,000 students live. Development plans had not allowed for enough open space, either for parks or for parking. The Citizens Committee requested an assessment district or a City bond issue to buy and develop a one-acre park. The City Committee on Open Space Requirements liked the idea and in September approved the plan, but could not give it final approval until they heard from the Parks and Recreation Commission whether a park was needed in the area, and what size and location would be best. Meanwhile, the Planning Commission could not take action until they heard from the Committee on Open Space Requirements.

After approximately two months of confusion, the request finally reached the City Council. Approved by all three groups, it now requested an assessment district to pay for a two-acre park which could include some parking space if necessary. At the Council meeting, two members of the economics department honor society announced that previous studies of residents' willingness to pay for an assessment district had been biased; they asked for a 30-day delay while they took their own survey. The Council, however, supported the Oxford Circle residents:

[field note]

"Well, you can kill anything with another study; these people [have] been working 1 1/2 years on this thing, like to give them our support, it's great what they're doing." [The Council] unanimously gave endorsement to [the] group and promised staff help. Reese, who had warned them about [the] price of [the] lot ("Do you have that on paper? Unless it's a legally signed paper, you can't count on that price, you may end up in court") told them to come to him afterwards and he'd help.

Both the Citizens Committee for Oxford Circle Open Space and the Northwest Davis Neighborhood Association were groups formed to combat specific problems. Another group, *The Greater Davis Research and Planning Group*, had a broader base of concern. It was begun in the summer of 1971 with the two-pronged intention of stopping city growth and of electing a "right-thinking" councilman. Unlike the previous two groups, it was not organized around a geographical neighborhood. Most of the members were graduate students (overwhelmingly from the Ecology Graduate Group), ex-students, professors, and other campus-connected activists.

Representatives from the Greater Davis Research and Planning Group gave a presentation to the Planning Commission (based on research done for an ecology course), using map overlays of geology, slope, and land capability classes to suggest development sites on non-prime agricultural land as an alternative to enlarging Davis. Another representative spoke before the City Council suggesting an "environmental impact statement" from developers. They opposed

the Peter McKeon townhouses, publicly supported Adler's suggested building freeze, and called for a general plan review to make Davis aware of its future and to wrest control from the developers. This group will be analyzed in Part Two.

OPPOSITION

When a social movement begins to form, opposition to it generally also arises. As the various groups in Davis began focusing on growth as an issue, other groups registered their opposition. This came out most clearly in relation to the proposed building moratorium. Letters of opposition were sent to the Planning Commission from both the Chamber of Commerce and the Associated Building Industries of Davis. The Davis Board of Realtors issued a public statement opposing the moratorium, using a slightly different image of "community."

Davis of the Twentieth Century has been willing to change and grow. It has been basically a sensitive, innovative town . . . it received honorable mention as an all-American town in 1963 None of these good things have happened under an edict which has thrown chains across the access streets to the city In 1905 local landowners in effect gave Davis the choice whether it wanted to grow or not by granting easements that made water easily available to the town from the State's irrigation system. If Davisville wanted a freeze on change, this was the time for it.²⁰

What is unusual about this social movement is the relative mildness of the opposition. Except for the brief period of the moratorium proposal, appointed and established groups did not become consistently and publicly involved. No new groups were formed. Individuals, not groups, publicly protested the "discourage" policy, both before the Chamber of Commerce and in the *Enterprise*.²¹ A certain amount of pressure, however, was put on the City Council and, through them, the Planning Commission.

[field note]

Maynard Skinner: I know you've been working on this and it is evolving, I would like the Planning Commission to enunciate what their procedure and policy will be Concern has been registered within the community among those with investment, development . . . I think they have a right to know.

Harry Miller: . . . on this discouraging of applications . . . [we need to know because of our] obligation to those with substantial obligations of development for the benefit of the community. . . .

One could argue that this "relative mildness" was all that was needed. The moratorium proposal was dropped and once the Planning Commission won permission for an associate planner and a citizens' committee to help in the general plan review, the "discourage" policy was discontinued. The public interest test remained until just before the Council election when it was declared unconstitutional by the city attorney.

ROLE OF THE NEWSPAPER

The *Davis Enterprise*, the daily local, had a circulation of approximately 5,000. It was one of those "intermediate structures" (Pinard's term) which played a great part in activating the issue through its communicating effects. Planning Commission and City Council "growth" issues, population projections, informational meetings held by established groups, and the formation of groups such as the Greater Davis Research and Planning Group all received prominent coverage. The word "growth" became a standby in the headlines. In an article summarizing the year of 1971, the *Enterprise's* front-page feature article concluded: "growth was THE issue of the year."²²

The *Enterprise* was thus active first, in letting people know what was happening; second, in helping people define what was happening in terms of one main category (growth); and third, in printing news of meetings and so forth, which might have helped in the mobilization of groups.

FOCUSING ON POLITICAL ACTION AS A CHANNEL FOR GOALS

The issue of growth was formulated by all of the types of groups discussed above. As is especially clear in the case of the new groups, this indicated that "more people were experiencing the event (consequences of growth) as a threat and were having strong emotional reactions against it."²³ As the issue of growth loomed larger, a narrowing of focus to the actions of the City Council as a common source of discontent occurred.²⁴

The Council was *not* always seen as the basic cause of dissatisfaction. Greater Davis group, for example, opposed big developers as the source of trouble, but saw the present Council as sympathetic to development. The Northwest Davis group also was upset over a specific developer's plans, but blamed the Council for not doing anything to alleviate the problem. Even the Oxford Circle group, who had eventually been supported by the Council, began to consider political change.

[informal interview]

Ira Bray: They just weren't responsive at first, it was a big runaround, like they'd send us to one commission and they'd say, very nice but we can't handle it, and send us somewhere else . . . just a runaround.

* * *

It was pointed out that three of the five city council positions will be on the line next election. . . a strong registration turnout could result in more student power with the open space issue.²⁵

Since three seats were open in the upcoming election, new candidates could command a majority. A one-time-only action would be sufficient: "vote the rascals out!" And, as mentioned above, although the actions of most of the groups could have focused on stopping the developers, the focus for fighting them became one of first winning the upcoming Council election.

Finally, as far as the issue of growth vs. community was concerned, the upcoming campaign had some "suitable" candidates. From its inception, the Greater Davis group had supported Bob

Black, who strongly opposed growth in his campaign. Dick Holdstock, the campus environmental officer, and Joan Poulos, a Davis lawyer, also emphasized the dangers of uncontrolled growth and supported environmental concerns. Their campaigns will be discussed in Part Three.

II. ZOOM LENS: DISSECTING AN ACTION GROUP

The preceding section has given a broad picture of the beginnings of a social movement involving various groups becoming involved in a specific issue and starting to focus on a specific channel of action for achieving their goals. What is not clear from this broad view, however, is the problematics of individual group formation and organization. As mentioned before, *ex post facto* studies tend to underestimate these uncertainties of existence since those groups which have failed to cope with contingencies drop out of the picture and are not analyzed. To emphasize the presence of uncertainty in group life, then, I shall focus on the dynamics of one specific group which may be taken as a model for other action groups.

The Greater Davis Research and Planning Group can be analyzed in terms of four phases as its organization gradually changed from an informal network of friends to a formal group. In phase one, *discovering interests that imply collective action*, a collection of friends or neighbors get together. In phase two, *initiating and planning*, they make the transition to an informal but distinct group. Phase three, *becoming public*, involves the transition of the private informal group to a public one. Although it now presents itself as a formal group, it is not. This final transition does not occur until phase four, *becoming a formal group*.

PHASE ONE: DISCOVERING INTERESTS THAT IMPLY ACTION

Phase one begins when friends or neighbors discover or decide²⁶ that they have similar or shared interests that imply collective action.

[interview]

Valerie [Anderson], Jon [Hammond], Glenn [Suter], and George [Burns] wrote a paper last spring for Ecology 201C that dealt with the local environment (Davis). It's not enough just to research ecology, you have to use political pressure.

* * *

[interview]

It sort of started first with Bob [Black] talking with Jon [Hammond] last spring; Jon asked him if he'd ever thought of running for City Council; he had a little. Then last May or June, I was at the Health Food Store, Bob and I were rapping about the 18-year-old vote and the Berkeley elections; I asked him whether he'd ever considered running since he's the "natural young candidate" from being ASUCD president and stuff. And he said, yeah, he had. He'd talked to Jon and his good friend Valerie about it too. Then we were all at Jon's and Lorie's [Hammond] place in the country, sitting around talking about it, it turned into a meeting, we wanted to do something.

They begin talking over these shared interests in one or more informal get-togethers, bringing in more people through existing friendship networks.²⁷

[interview]

We decided to have another meeting. At this one there were about 12-15 people, mostly brought by Jon and Val from the ecology grad group; and Professor Tom, and John [Pamperin], and Chuck [Lindner], they were brought by Bob.

The spark to action may be a specific local event²⁸ but it doesn't have to be. It may be, as in the case of the Greater Davis group, a merging of various interests focused on events that are occurring as well as on events that are in the future. Phase one ends when the people involved decide to take collective action to further their interests.

Even this early stage of group formation is *problematic*. Those involved may never discover their shared interests: they may not be close friends who talk over almost everything with each other, they may not see each other often enough, or the topic may just never come up. In the Greater Davis group the presence of interlocking friendships helped connect the two interests (ecological concern and political action) to create the idea of an ecological-political group.

Even if the people involved discover their shared interests, they may never carry their discussions far enough to decide to take collective action. The interests (goals) must be important enough to them to make action not only logically implied but necessary. The action must also, perhaps, seem somewhat practicable to them. Greater Davis members, for example, felt that individual action for ecological concern was ineffective. They were not, however, as discouraged about the possibility of influencing the political structure.²⁹ Thus their venture seemed feasible to them.

Of the two, importance to the individual seems to weigh more heavily than feasibility in the decision to take action. Action may appear feasible and practical and likely to succeed, yet if it does not appear important enough to enough people, nothing will come of it. On the other hand, "hopeless causes" have managed to recruit people who are certain there is little or no hope for success but feel that the cause is so important that it is better to be martyrs than to condone inaction.

PHASE TWO: INITIATING AND PLANNING

The five processes involved in the transition to a distinct informal group in phase two may occur simultaneously or in a rough, overlapping chronology. (1) Phase two begins when the collection of friends join interests, forming and *naming a group* to take collective action. The search for a name can be time-consuming, as group members consider the implication of various titles, anticipating the third stage when the group will be introduced to the public.³⁰

[interview]

A couple of meetings later we named ourselves. I wanted the Green Cooperative, George [Burns], who used to be in the SDS in Seattle, wanted "People" in the name but we didn't want to get

connected with the radical thing in the name and Greater Davis Research and Planning Cooperative was suggested. Bob presented that name at a meeting where I was absent, they changed the name from Cooperative to Group. The name came as a compromise, no one was really happy with it--it doesn't make an acronym or anything. It has advantages, though, you can answer the phone, "Greater Davis," like its a vision of the future or something; also it indicated the ecology ring in the title.

This process of trying out names and imagining what the public reaction will be is a familiar Herbert Blumer sermon. Just as people imaginatively construct various selves in advance, so a group may try out its future public image in imagination.³¹

(2) In *formulating an ideology*, group members attempt to spell out, more or less precisely, just what ideals they value and the general style they will use to realize their ideals for a better future. The three components of the Greater Davis ideology were indicated in a mimeographed sheet prepared during the summer meetings: Greater Davis "is a group of Davis citizens seeking to develop and encourage a higher level of awareness and concern about the Ecological/Social/Political issues facing our community."

(a) Greater Davis people started with the Ecology 201 paper's conclusions: "We feel it is of primary importance to maintain the support capability of the earth" and to "minimize [negative] environmental impact."³²

(b) Besides this environmental concern, social concerns pervaded the ideology in terms of what an ideal community should be. The conclusion was that a community should be small (well under 30,000 people) for both environmental and social reasons.³³ The mimeographed sheet from the summer meetings stated: To help Davis remain a well-defined community with a true 'feeling of community.'"

[interview]

. . . there's some sort of community spirit that pervades some of the student types who live around here (though some of it is a myth), they see Davis as slow, quiet, fondness for that is a motivating part of what we're doing, like "I've more or less adopted Davis as my home, though I may split anytime . . . our answer is that it doesn't matter that we're only here temporarily because American society as a whole is transient. "Any place you are is home and you should make home "spiffy."

(c) The third ideological component is that of a new style of political action:

[field note]

Originally we didn't want to be just another pressure group. We were sort of the New Style, open, honest . . . but when other community groups aren't that way, it's strange . . . not what they can do for Davis, but cliques and factions and what can they do for their clique. . . we're

trying to pump a little bit of ideology into American politics, but ideology that's more rational, enlightened.

Bud Steubing [?] came along with the idea of being politically upfront, asking: haven't we learned anything from our experiences, mind expansion, encounters, and so on? In upfront politics, must be new style, really honest, confront truth, etc.

(3) A third process in becoming a distinct group, closely related to formulating an ideology, is that of *specifying goals and tactics*. In this process, the specifics implied by the ideology are planned and negotiated. For the Greater Davis group, the major goal--given an ideology valuing environmental husbandry and the social effects of a small-town community--would logically be that of stopping population growth and development spread.

[interview]

Our original goal was to stop or slow growth, we vacillate between which one we want, probably you can't stop growth altogether.

* * *

[interview]

They want to stop the growth of Davis and to get support for ecology . . . they're trying to stop growth because from Interstate 80 to the Dixon foothills is great agricultural land, the most productive per acre in the world.

The "support for ecology" mentioned above is another closely-related goal. It is not enough merely to stop growth (as a benevolent dictator could do), the public must act as an enlightened community, aware of the environmental impact of its actions.

[field note]

What we see as our role is to get Davis people to get a sense of community, get them to see their common problems, and hopefully, some common solutions . . . we may have to tell them what their common problems are, maybe that's our first job, to educate the people.

These ecological actions, to be effective, cannot be just on the individual level (putting bricks in toilet bowls or recycling newspapers). Instead, they must be implemented on a group level, in city and university policies. Social power is necessary.

[interview]

Individual good deeds . . . that's nice . . . but it's just not where it's at. See, we started to get a position of power through the electoral process with the students as a power base . . . that's not our only goal, but we're focused around that . . . it started as an attempt to change Davis in some fashion.

Tactics were fairly standard "work through the system" ones. At an August meeting, for example, proposals included: find and enlist the aid of interested persons and groups; tap the resources of women as a group in Davis--try day care; go to and report on Council and Planning Commission meetings; do environmental education through the schools; do research on various topics such as housing, zoning, waste disposal, and the financial and social costs of subdivisions. Since a major technique was going to be that of educating the community, doing research was a necessary preliminary. The idea was that when the time came, they would work hard on Bob's campaign. They would also work to influence the Planning Commission with the importance of stopping growth.

In any group, there may be disagreement over which tactics or goals to emphasize³⁴ and negotiations occur and may continue throughout the life of the group.³⁵ In Greater Davis, the basic conflict was between those most concerned with the long-range environmental goals and those emphasizing a short-term political goal--Bob's election to the Council. The group worked out its internal differences by dividing into an "action wing" of political goals and a "research wing" of environmental goals, but this split remained a source of friction throughout the study.³⁶

[field note]

At one time, Jon Hammond was saying to Bob Black, "we're not sure we want Greater Davis to be used as a springboard for your candidacy." Bob said something like maybe when we set up this group, our goals were too abstract and idealistic, "I'm just not in it for the same reasons you [ecology students] are."

(4) As the group continues, a fourth process occurs, a beginning of stratification.

As Herbert Gans puts it, this rudimentary stratification consists of "a small group of active people [leaders] and a large number of members who do little more than attend meetings."³⁷ The leadership coterie may consist of the original founders, but this need not be the case. Energetic workers with new ideas to push may take over the group³⁸ or may be admitted to the existing leadership structure. In the Greater Davis group, the energetic workers came from the founding group. Valerie Anderson ended up doing most of the organizational/secretarial work, while Jon Hammond acted as co-presenter of ecological proposals. Bob Black and Chuck Lindner were active in political planning and Bob was also seen as sort of the symbolic leader of the whole group. At this point, however, these were informal leaders. They had no formal position and led by personality, not by bureaucratic authority.

(5) During this initiating and planning stage, group members are also beginning to anticipate opposition. They formulate, at least in general terms, which people or groups will probably be against their program. These potential enemies include those whose economic self-interest may be threatened by the proposed action--such as realtors and developers--and also those who are part of the status quo that needs changing, such as "unresponsive" Council members. A pre-publication statement of purpose singled out these enemies in abstract term:

The present tendency of both public policy and private development is transforming Davis into a sprawling bedroom community. A change of that magnitude deserves public debate.

Problematic for a group in the second phase of existence is the comfortable merging of interests and relative emphases on goals. In the case of Greater Davis, this problem was recognized and smoothed over by the formation of the two wings. It was never completely resolved, a gentle tug-of-war was constantly taking place between the leaders of the two wings, generally with the ecologists prevailing.

An action group may find, however, that disagreement on specifics is non-negotiable. So many people may withdraw that the group fails, or the split may create such bad feelings that the group falls apart in feuds.

PHASE THREE: BECOMING PUBLIC

Four main processes are involved in the transition to a public group. As in phase two, these processes need not be chronological. (1) First is *announcing their existence to the public*. In this announcement, the group presents itself as a formal organization, usually including names of formal leaders and a formal statement of purpose.³⁹ Greater Davis held a press conference at the end of September, preceded by a news release "for immediate publication" of its statement of purpose and list of objectives. In formal prose, the release identified the group as "a citizens organization which for the last five months has been engaged in research on the ecological and social issues facing our community." The overarching objectives of this group were: "A public awareness of life-support systems and their importance. The maintenance of a sense of community in the face of massive change. A public seeking to support and elect officials who will include ecological thinking in city programs and policies." After a brief explication of the rationale for proposing limited (i.e., internally generated) growth, the statement continues with a listing of seven specific program objectives, including promotion of a full-scale revision of what was then known as the Davis Master Plan (a Yolo County planning document) and promotion of an ordinance requiring developers to state the impact of their project on ecology, including human ecology.

The press conference was given front-page coverage in the *Davis Enterprise*, together with a picture of Bob as a member of the seven-man steering committee. Valerie Anderson, Mickey Tanner, and Roger Greensfelder were quoted, as three other steering committee members. (Dick, Chuck Lindner, and Jon Hammond, the final three members, were not present.) Their statement of purpose and list of goals was printed in full on the second page.⁴⁰

In this way, the informal group is creating a myth: that is, being accepted by their audience as what they say they are. As Dick commented later, "the press created the myth, they made us a public force." [field notes]

(2) At this point, the group begins *adding members by public means*. People may still bring in friends as members but methods to attract a more extensive membership are used as well. Membership drives, open invitations to the public, and formal meetings may all be used to attract members. The Greater Davis group made an attempt to select members whose aims and general approach would be compatible to those already in the group.

[interview]

The first public meeting was at the Methodist Church, we did our map-slide show . . . Mickey [Tanner] is second- or third-generation resident, John [Pamperin] knows what's going on. They made a list of about 50 people they thought would be interested and mailed letter to them saying "Greater Davis invites *you*,"

This process is similar to that in phase one where friends discover shared interests. But here members of the group decide on the basis of what they know about people (who may or may not be friends or even acquaintances), who might share their interests and formally invite them to join.

Greater Davis held several formal informational meetings, using the map overlays mentioned in Part One to present their ecological message. Audience members could come up afterwards and ask further questions, especially those audience members who were perceived as potentially influential.

[interview]

[Gerald] Adler showed up, heard our spiel on slow or stop growth, he came up afterwards saying it's nice but you can't do it given the political realities that exist, you have to fight holding actions. Then in October he introduced his moratorium, evidently caught it from us, so that's some effect that we've had, we made the issue.

After this series of informational meetings, the group went back to informal meetings. The decision to change illustrates the reality of this phase: it is still an informal group where decisions are made backstage.

[interview]

We were having a potluck at Jon and Lorie's Hammond, just dinner in the country; since there were quite a few people there we had a meeting after dinner; decided that potlucks would be a good idea and Sunday would be a good day. . . they just started from a Saturday in the country.

(3) In phase three, the group begins *taking public action* in the name of the group. It is still an informal group but it is acting "as if" it were a formal group. This can be done successfully only if they have successfully created a myth. Conversely, continuing public actions help in keeping the myth alive.

[interview]

Bob read a letter he'd written to the Mayor about the citizens' committee, explaining that this would be a good subtle way to slide back into the active role since we hadn't been doing anything for a month. . . let them know we're still around.

Newspaper coverage of Greater Davis was good from the beginning and it was accepted in further articles as a bona fide group. In the year-summary issue of the *Enterprise*, for example, Greater Davis was mentioned as a new group concerned with growth; it got a whole paragraph, the only new group to be singled out. Several public groups invited Greater Davis members (or accepted their offers) to come speak to them on issues of growth. With the acceptance of the myth, then, individuals could carry out separate activities as "representatives of Greater Davis."

[field note]

Nancy Whittaker [?] said that when she and Lorie Hammond went before the Democratic Women's group, they felt like there was quite a bit of interest, people talked to her afterward, they seemed to be into a lot of the same things that Greater Davis was interested in.

* * *

[field note]

Chuck Lindner spoke before the City Council as a Greater Davis member; he called for an environmental impact statement from developers.

* * *

[field note]

We met with M.J. Brock, he had with him lawyers, consultants--just think! \$1000-an-hour consultants for a group of maybe 15 students and some professors!

(4) Phase three is the first phase in which the group is publicly recognized. It is therefore at this stage that public opposition emerges and the group begins *grappling with the enemy*. Not surprisingly, opposition to Greater Davis' aims came from the same strata that opposed some of the Planning Commission's decisions. However, as stated in Part One, these strata never created their own new groups to fight against the anti-growth forces. Thus, although Greater Davis saw itself beset with enemies, members had to make a little opposition go a long way.

[field note]

Then Roger Greensfelder asked Bob about the ban-the-can issue, Bob said it was pretty well dead, the Council was going to set up a Commission instead (this said derogatorily), then adding, "They're so blatant about the way they co-opt people . . . 'That's a very interesting point, Mrs. Blank, would you like to be on our commission? We liked your presentation Mr. Blank, you can be on the Commission too.' That will keep them quiet another six months."

* * *

[field note]

John Pamperin, talking to the group: things have changed some from the August scene--at least you've made a lot of realtors nervous . . . at the meeting where the moratorium was proposed, I've never seen so many realtors there, even John Brinley, and Brinley never goes anywhere.

The meeting with M.J.Brock in which he'd "been arrogant," was continuously replayed in Greater Davis lore as proof that this developer had no interest in fulfilling ecological goals and that he was one of the powerful enemies subverting the desires of the citizenry.

[field note]

But Brock is stronger than Davis; the developers can do more than the Council can.

As the group continued and as core members of the ecology research wing took a course on corporate structure, the new enemies of "interlocking directorates" appeared; the old enemy of "developer" was clarified to that of "big, non-local developer fronting for corporate interests."

[field note]

Valerie got out her charts; one was of the Albertsons people showing what other corporations they were connected with, pointing out banks and railroads as ones that Carnation (the other chart) was also connected with, as well as lots of others. "So nice old Albertson isn't just the nice old rural storekeeper" . . . he's got all these connections in the corporate structure . . . corporate businesses usually mean land becomes something to be exploited rather than something to be husbanded.

* * *

[field note]

Talked about having had meetings with Frank Liggett too. Before he used local subcontractors etc., now this time going to be using various non-local companies connected with corporations, locals losing out to the biggies . . . Liggett saying "a guy like me" is going to eventually have to become part of the big company, and then going to be swallowed up, and in a couple of years is going to try to sell out, try to start a small business, try something else. Can't do much about it--feelings not against Liggett, just about effectiveness of fighting against the biggies; eventually there's going to be maybe three giant corporations you can work for, no chance of Liggett's son being a small contractor like Liggett is.

Greater Davis members were also able to find personal enemies in the local arena.

[field note]

Robert Warren has a conflict of interest. . . seems like it would be better if he weren't chairman of the Planning Commission when he has this conflict of interest. I'm not saying he shouldn't be on the commission but not as chairman. . . I wonder why the Council appointed him chairman, that tells you a lot about where the Council is at.

* * *

[interview]

Well, we now think of Adler as kinda a shifty figure. Adler's crazy. He's a lawyer, has the jargon, but when the "grit come to scratch," he backs down . . . he backed down on the moratorium.

In its attempted transition to a public group, the action group's existence is still precarious and it faces a number of *problematics*. First, of course, is the possibility that the times are not right for the myth; that the public will not accept the group and its goals as reasonable or serious. This alone, however, need not harm the group since being ignored or being ridiculed can be interpreted as opposition and the group's members may simply work all the harder.⁴¹ Yet for sensitive souls or for those who depend on public support, such indifference or ridicule may kill the budding movement.

This fits in with what Maurice Jackson, et al. discussed in "Failure of an Incipient Social Movement."⁴² The movement (or group) must have a public image of sustained and growing strength, which may include burgeoning membership. If the membership drive fails or if an event is planned which turns into a fiasco for the group, it may fail.

The Greater Davis membership drive was not a success in terms of large numbers of people present at all meetings, but it was a technical success in getting names on a "membership list." Also, since what action was taken was generally taken by individuals in the name of the group, a small core of active people could act as representatives of Greater Davis and present a public image of continued activity.

Phase three may also signal the death of the group if it creates overwhelming public opposition; not just enough to build morale and *esprit de corps*, but the sort that is too much opposition, such as systematic assassination. Unless group members care enough to be martyrs, that would probably do it.

More likely in this situation, however, is the failure of the group through not enough opposition. As Luther Gerlach and Virginia Hine argue, "Without opposition from the established order, there would be no risk, no bridge-burning, and hence no commitment required for participation. . . .thus robbing the movement of its strength."⁴³ Greater Davis teetered on the verge on this danger for it opposed certain groups much more than certain groups appeared to oppose it. Members, however, were able to perceive opposition, which substituted for the weakness of "direct opposition."⁴⁴

Since in phase three, the group is still an informal group, albeit one with a formal image, a final danger to its continued existence is the loss of its leaders. The problem is that no formal mechanisms exist to replace vacated leadership positions which remain connected to personalities rather than offices. Nearly all of Greater Davis' work activities were being done by a few of the original members. If they had dropped out, the group probably could not have continued. As long as some of them remained, however, it would conceivably have been possible for a single leader to depart without dissolving the group.

The possibility of dissolution was imminent in December when Bob, the leader and the only consistently active worker for the political action wing, decided not to run for City Council. He and his supporters seemed to feel that his decision might signal the end of the group's existence. This possibility, however, was firmly rejected by Valerie, the leader of the ecology research wing. (By the next meeting, Bob was running again.)

[field note]

Bob: we'd better have a meeting, things to consider tonight--what's Greater Davis, does it exist or should it continue to exist . . . I guess most of you know that I'm not going to run for City Council.

* * *

[field note]

John Pamperin, talking about coordinating little groups: "that's why I'm very concerned if Greater Davis ceases tonight." Valerie: "No, oh no. No way. We aren't stopping.

PHASE FOUR: BECOMING A FORMAL GROUP

As noted above, as long as the group is an informal one, it is less stable, prone to disruption or dissolution through the loss of key persons. The fourth phase, in which it makes the transition to a formal group, adds some much needed stability. Five main processes comprise this stage.

(1) The first process in becoming a formal group is *bureaucraticizing leadership*. The leaders may be elected or chosen in some other standardized manner to fill named, continuing position. Thus, if a person leaves the group, his position will be filled by someone else chosen in the approved manner, giving continuity to the structure. The hierarchy may also include committees of appointees, electees, or volunteers, as well as the more informal recognition of active members, followers, and so on.

The leadership of Greater Davis never quite stabilized into formal positions. The steering committee, a formal title for the main founders of the group, atrophied. By the time of the potluck dinners in November, no one referred to these offices at all. They had been used primarily, almost exclusively, for the group's dealings with the press; as far as what was happening in Greater Davis, the titles were irrelevant. They coincided to the actual leadership to the extent that all leaders were on the steering committee, but not all seven of the steering committee were leaders

Greater Davis' leadership remained in the "personal following" mold rather than that of formal positions. Valerie was the main leader of the research wing and ended up with most of the chores of organizing action or doing research. She was assisted mostly by Jon, who also took the spokesman role for their wing both in internal meetings and in outside meetings where he represented the group.

[field note]

Val is a strong Leo chick, powerful woman, she can get her thing through.

* * *

[field note]

Glenn Suter asked Valerie whom she'd invited to the meeting; evidently she and Jon had arranged for a man from Sacramento to come talk to the group . . . the guest speaker showed up, Jon introduced him to the group.

* * *

[field note]

Everyone is visiting like mad in little groups. Jon comes over to Val, says hate to break up the conversations but we ought to do some business though . . . (raising his voice slightly) Roger Greensfelder, will you call your end of the room to order, we're going to have a meeting, we need to come up with some ecology questions for Tom Tomasi's group, we're (meaning he and Val) meeting with them Thursday . . . Val writes down the questions as people give them to her.

Bob was the leader of the action wing, although most of the action he initiated was outside Greater Davis, connected with running for office. He was the still the symbolic (slightly figurehead) leader for the group. He also came the closest to filling the duties of a president when Greater Davis had a meeting with something special to discuss. (If he was absent, Jon substituted--see episode above.)

[field note]

Jay pointed out Bob, bearded redhead sitting on the couch, he's "our leading figure," the probable candidate come April. Bob moved up so he was sitting on the arm of the couch, said: Ok, let's start the meeting. We can't start with a secretary's report (some laughs from the group), but we'll go right into old business.

These three people (Val, Jon, and Bob) would probably be recognized as the leaders by most people in Greater Davis. Others were active, but tended to report to one of these three, especially to Valerie and Jon, or to look to them for direction.

(2) A second process is that of *formalizing communication procedures*. When the group is merely a group of friends, informal communication is adequate to distribute information through the group. With a larger membership, including a sprinkling of strangers (those not seen in class or at other meetings: I was a stranger), more formal means of communication are necessary.⁴⁵

Valerie typed a master list of members' names and addresses on a carbon set of address labels. When a meeting was to be held, the time, place, and subject matter were dittoed and pasted onto a postcard with the address labels pasted on the front. This postcard method, however, was not as thorough as it sounds. For one thing, the master list was incomplete. (Neither Roger Greensfelder nor Valerie, for example, were on the list: both were steering committee members.) Also, cards were not sent to everyone on the list; whoever sent out the cards that week used his/her discretion and only those considered "active" or likely to come would receive a card. This decision, and thus the number of cards mailed, would vary from meeting to meeting.

A more reliable method of learning about meetings, then, was to telephone one of the leaders or active members. Informal word-of-mouth remained a major channel of communication.

[data source uncertain]

Bill Drips told me there was a meeting tonight . . . he'd been helping Valerie with a cold frame that morning and she'd told him about it.

* * *

[interview]

I told Dick that I could give him back his paper at the Greater Davis meeting. He said, 'oh, is there a meeting tonight?' See, that's how this thing works--the word just spreads.

(3) Another process in becoming a formal group is organizing a system of *financial contributions for bureaucratic functions*. This may be done through dues, free-will offerings, bake sales, or whatever. The amount of money necessary usually depends on the number, expense, or complexity of the bureaucratic functions (publicity, lobbying, doing research, record-keeping, bribing, and so on; salaries may be included).

For Greater Davis, expenses were minimal. Publicity was handled through press releases (news is free) or letters to the editor. Research was done as class work. The only real cost was in the buying and mailing of postcards. At the first two meetings in November, each member was supposed to donate "a quarter for postcards." This donation period was not formalized as a regular part of the meeting; instead, it was tacked on as an afterthought.

[field note]

The meeting had been over about 8:30, now it piddled out more, about eleven people left . . . Bob asked them to put in a quarter again for mailing; it had evidently covered it about right last week, though Val said we might owe Nancy Whittaker [?] a little bit from last time.

Even this system of financial contribution was stopped after the two November meetings. Perhaps enough money had been collected. In at least some cases, the person doing the postcards just paid out of his own pocket.

Two closely related processes in phase four are (4) *assigning tasks* and (5) *formally sanctioning behavior*. An informal group may accomplish its actions through volunteers who decide on individual projects which they may or may not carry through. A formal group must have a less free-wheeling method of choosing its activities and seeing that they are carried out.

From a formal list of tasks, committee heads or workers are appointed or elected. (They may still volunteer, but the system is no longer one of someone initiating and carrying through his own original idea. It is the president saying, "we need someone to write a list of questions, does anyone volunteer?") Then if they fail to carry out their duties, they can be formally sanctioned. This may be done through a system of fines, demerits, loss of privileges (such as voting), loss of

membership, or whatever, but there is formal power that the group can wield against slothful or deviant members.

Greater Davis never quite developed either of these systems. Tasks still depended upon individual inspiration rather than formal assignments.

[field note]

Bob showed a proper map of the area around Davis, it had been drawn by a girl named Liza; she'd been going to come and explain it tonight but he said he didn't see her here.

Individual inspiration can change from meeting to meeting with nothing ever being accomplished from these fleeting ideas.

[field note]

Mike Gilson was saying he wanted something to happen with Greater Davis but he's not sure how to go about it, things he tries don't seem to work . . . this meeting he wasn't so much on helping local Davis businesses (work out possibility of favored treatment for locals vs. disadvantages for big corporations; he'd been enthusiastic about that last meeting) but more on working out a model community here, one that's ecologically sound . . .

The process of sanctioning deviant behavior, including but not limited to neglect of tasks, never became a formal one (or even a strong informal one). In part, this was because members perceived it as unnecessary. As one member told me,

Infinite deviation within the group is allowed, well . . . (pause, think), if a planner came to our meeting, we'd be nice to him, he probably wouldn't be interested though . . . it doesn't really come up because the group is self-selecting.

In part, it was due to the ideology of the new style, more open behavior and the idea of "do your own thing."

[interview]

The most we get are characterological discussions against a background of assuming that everybody is ok . . . everybody more or less respects each other . . . we're not interested in being the super-spiffy clean, organized organization.

Also, since most of the active membership still consisted of friendship networks, formal sanctions were seen as inappropriate or uncomfortable in such a situation. Greater Davis members had to hustle around to use other types of sanctions (incentives to action). First, informal sanctions such as kidding or gentle nudging were occasionally, but rarely, used. They

were quite ineffective, especially when used in enforcing a task the leaders had attempted to assign.

[interview]

Once they were into some sort of "study of drugs in Davis" trip, gonna have me do it since I'm a sociologist and "that's what sociologist do, right?"; I had to say, that's not my trip . . . I had to say it three or four times, especially to Val and Jon . . . they wouldn't do it in the group like a group pressure thing, but before the meeting, out in the kitchen or something, "Hey, when you gonna do it" or you done any work on it?" Not always to me, they'd say it and then I'd hear about it, like through Bob, so I went to Val and Jon, saying "that's not my trip, out-rapped them as a strategy, they finally accepted that.

Second, a way was found to get sanctions from outside the group and use these as spurs to action. Thus, at the meetings I attended, most of the projects or research reported had been done as part of a class project where presumably the external sanctions of grades and academic credit applied.

[field note]

When Valerie put up the charts of the corporate connections of Albertsons and Carnation she was asked why she chose Carnation. She said others in the class had done other corporations, but they'd dealt with Albertsons, someone else had done Hunt-Wesson, etc.

This was hazily recognized by those who did not have academic involvements.

[field note]

Bob said that the others were on the academic scene, "I'm not in school, others doing it on academic science, Dick and I are the only two doing it as a (sorta stumble, then) "labor of love."

Bob also had a different type of external motivation for action: the instrumental value of political campaigning. If he did nothing, he hadn't much chance of winning. Also, he was able to develop support for action from commitments outside the group.

[field note]

Bob and John Pamperin had gone to some meeting that John had set up, meeting of "liberals" to work on the campaign or something.

Bob had to leave early, another meeting . . . Judy saw him leave, wondered why, I said I thought he had some sherry party . . . she said, wow, what a lot a candidate has to go through, go to all those meetings.

The *problematics* in phase four have to do with the success or failure of the group's goals. If the major goal fails or is perceived as failing the group may fall apart. On the other hand, if the public action succeeds and the group's goals were limited to that specific result, the group has no reason to continue.⁴⁶ Unless it develops new goals or becomes a sociability group, it will discontinue.

Since Greater Davis had both short-term and long-range goals, the success or failure of any one goal had little effect on the group's continued existence. In fact, specific results (both success and failure) following from the major goal of stopping growth were interpreted as reasons for continuing. When Adler introduced the moratorium, it was considered a success ("we made the issue"). When it was dropped in the next planning commission meeting (a failure of the group), it was seen as an impetus to more activity, as well as in some sense, still a victory.

[interview]

What got us back into politics, especially Jon, was the defeat of the moratorium, we found out that the powers-that-be just weren't going to do anything . . . it was a victory in one sense, it got the master plan thing going.

Furthermore, a constant process of negotiation of aims continued at the potluck dinners. If one goal failed or appeared to be weakening, there were always alternatives to be considered.

[field note]

Val (when Bob decided not to run): we still have a political role for Greater Davis; we can still have a checklist, measure candidates against what we want, inform the community about these qualifications, how they measure up to our aims, whether we have a candidate or not.

Mike Gilson: we've been coming to meetings about 5 or 6 times . . . I'm sorta saying it's abstract talk, talk and research about problems but not much going toward solutions, what about alternatives, what can we offer as alternatives to what's happening that we don't like? (Some replies of 'this is a research group.') Then why can't we research solutions, push for more specifics, like why can't we get a grant for a model community, keep out non-ecological things?

Glenn Suter: I'm questioning where Greater Davis is heading, wonder if our original purpose is getting obscured, maybe we ought to go back to our original goal of no growth.

Another possibility in phase four is that the processes creating the transition to a formal group never take place and the group remains primarily an informal network of friends, thus remaining basically unstable. Greater Davis, for example, made a stab at being a formal group but fell back into informality. The named structure of leadership positions gradually dissolved ("we had an executive committee, but it's faded away"). Formal meetings were abandoned in favor of informal potlucks. The formal method of postcards instead of, or supplementing, word-of-mouth

communication was never too reliable and never reached all members. The haphazard collection of quarters was discontinued.

Finally, and most importantly in terms of action possibilities, no system of formal sanctioning was ever developed for achieving planned, appointed tasks. Informal sanctions, used only rarely, were ineffective. What work was done was done primarily under the pressure of classroom assignments. The disadvantage in this type of outside control is that the topics, and thus the emphases of the groups, changed as professor and classes changed from quarter to quarter.⁴⁷ Instead of retaining a primarily ecological "save agricultural land--slow growth" emphasis (a legacy from Ecology 201), the group shifted to an anti-corporation campaign. For the political action wing, external incentives meant that those interested in political action became less active in Greater Davis and did more of their work through other channels, thus reducing the group's potential role in the campaign.

The group process or life history of Greater Davis, considered as an organism, may be characterized as one of "facultative estivation" (estivation is a period of torpidity or dormancy). In biology, obligatory estivation occurs when the organism (insects are prime examples) has no choice in its estivation period (such as being linked to the seasons). In facultative estivation, the insect can choose when to go into estivation, coming out when conditions are right for its continued growth. This seems to be what Greater Davis has done.

The group dropped back, fluctuating in its activities between phase two and phrase three. A residue of phase three remained in the public myth lingering on. Greater Davis was still considered a formal group by the mass media; individuals could still act as "representatives of Greater Davis" in their interaction with other groups. Thus the possibility remained that Greater Davis could still make the transition from phase three to phase four, given the proper event.

The implication for other action groups is clear. If an informal group can make it through phase three and be accepted as a viable group by the public, it can then revert to dormancy in phase two. From there it may still emerge as a public force for special events, especially since the public perceives the group as already in phase four.

III. WIDE-ANGLE LENS: CHANNELING ACTION

Various people and groups in Davis had focused on growth as an issue. Now these and other groups began to focus on the campaign for City Council as an action channel to achieve their goals on limiting growth. Not all the groups mentioned in Part One were active as groups in the campaign, although individuals in each group may have been involved: some groups filled primarily informational roles, not action-mobilization one. But since growth was a campaign issue⁴⁸ these various groups, through their emphasis on growth, had helped to generate interest in the campaign. Members were more likely to follow the campaign because of their previous awareness of growth: thus they read about it, stayed interested, and were probably more likely to participate.⁴⁹

Three seats were up for re-election. On these, two incumbents decided not to seek re-election, so only one, Harry Miller, was involved in the race. Nine candidates ran for the three positions. They were: Miller, the 4-H advisor at the University; Gregg Manston, an 18-year-old student; Al

Eaton, a rock-shop owner; Fred Pearson, a jeweler; Ron Whitworth, a bookstore assistant manager; Fred Foerster, a restaurant manager; Joan Poulos, an attorney; Richard Holdstock, a public health sanitarian and campus environmental officer; and Bob Black, the part-owner of a natural foods store.

Of these candidates, Black, Holdstock, and Poulos quickly became the "liberal" candidates. Although Poulos publicly denied that they were running as a coalition, the three of them consistently appeared together at campus rallies, and the informational packets that "liberal" precinct workers (meaning volunteers who walked "precincts" for their candidate/s) were given included promotional literature on all three. As one student coordinator explained at a Clamor Club post-mortem, "she ran independently as a separate candidate in town, but on campus she was definitely part of the triumvirate."

If these three were the "liberal coalition," then Miller, Pearson, and Foerster might be characterized as the "downtown businessmen's coalition." Although they did not run as a formal slate, their positions tended to form a constellation of interests, often in opposition to those of the "liberal coalition."⁵⁰

APPOINTED GROUPS

The appointed groups introduced in Part One did not take an active part, as groups, in the campaign. Individuals were active however, as those who were interested enough to become involved in the general plan review as part of the citizens' committee were also interested enough to become involved in working for a candidate or candidates. Bob's campaign manager, Michael Gilson, for example, was on the Open Space subcommittee (as well as having been active in the Oxford Circle group); and a member of the subcommittee on Development and Redevelopment (one of the founders, now inactive, of Greater Davis) was on his election committee.

The Planning Commission added an election issue by its decisions concerning a proposed Lewis Homes subdivision of 58 single-family homes south of Interstate 80 and north of Putah Creek. Using the public interest test they had formulated earlier (see footnote 9), the commissioners unanimously rejected the proposal. Lewis Homes appealed to the City Council and at a public hearing in February, City Attorney James Callaway claimed to the Council that the Commissioners had illegally rejected the project. The public interest test can be used only before land is zoned for subdivision use. Once land is zoned (as this was), the state subdivision map act restricts the legally permissible criteria to the consideration of internal design and improvements. He noted, however, that new subdivision act provisions, making more criteria available, would go into effect on March 4.

The Council sent the subdivision proposal back to the Planning Commission. Once again it was rejected, this time on a 3-2 vote with one abstention and one absence. The Commissioners cited specific sections in the subdivision code as the basis for their decision.⁵¹ Again, Lewis Homes appealed the decision.

The Council, on February 28, overruled the Planning Commission and approved the subdivision on a 3-2 vote, with the three "aye" votes coming from the three councilmen whose seats were up

for re-election. On March 4, the new state subdivision law went into effect. It expanded the criteria of rejection to include:⁵²

That the subdivision is not consistent with all the principles in a general plan. Or that, the subdivision is planned for a site not environmentally suitable for the type or density of development proposed.

The new law would thus evidently allow something like a public interest test to be applied, although it might have to be legally tested.

The timing of the Council's overruling of the Planning Commission brought bitter comments in the student newspaper and in the campaign itself. Bill Drips wrote:

It seems odd that the council was so anxious to pass the matter that evening. In particular, councilman Harry Miller and Mayor Vigfus Asmundson pushed for a decision that evening. What was the rush? Why couldn't we wait for the questions to be settled? The answer is that (describes the new subdivision law passed five days later) . . . It seemed that the council wanted to push the decision through under the deadline so that the development could not be refused on the grounds that it was not in the public interest.⁵³

* * *

[field note]

Miller (at a League of Women Voters debate): . . . the sign law was hastily passed; I'd like to delay it pending further study. Holdstock: I wish Mr. Miller had the same concern about delays in some of the developments he's been in such a hurry to approve.

ESTABLISHED GROUPS

Many established groups were active in communicating information about candidates and issues during the campaign. Clamor Club devoted three sessions to a grilling of the candidates, once for them to present their platforms, once to point out where they felt they differed, and once for audience members to give their points of disagreement with the candidates. When the candidates were polled on "growth," the two main constellations of goals emerged.

Pearson said that he does not advocate stopping growth but controlling it "as it is being controlled now." Foerster pointed out that having an "abundance" of apartments in Davis keeps rents lower, and that if growth is stopped, "those who can least afford it will be hurt the most." Miller said that stopping growth would cause Davis to "stagnate."

Black stated that although he was not in favor of stopping growth altogether, he was very much in favor of "curtailing" it through aggressive city action. He emphasized that he had been active in attempts to preserve agricultural land and limit growth to Davis needs. Holdstock also referred to the preservation of agricultural land and argued that Davis should establish an upper limit on its population. Poulos felt that the issue was not growth per se but "how to grow," and noted that

cities have the power to annex land and zone it agricultural, thus effectively precluding development on it.

Additional points were made at the debate sponsored by the League of Women Voters. When a questioner prefaced her query with the remark that all candidates had advocated "controlled growth," Pearson corrected her: "I have not explicitly come out for controlled growth of Davis." He felt that the problem has been "blown out of proportion," and anyway, since Davis bases its growth on University expansion, the growth will level off in about ten years when the University stops expanding. Foerster also caviled at the "controlled growth" question, remarking that it went against the grain of his philosophy. "I don't believe in inhibiting, I believe in creating." Miller emphasized the likelihood of leap-frogging development on the outskirts of the city if development were drastically restricted.

Black argued against Pearson's contention that controlled University growth would mean controlled city growth, given Davis' attractiveness to Sacramento and Vacaville commuters. He argued that this "bedroom housing" should be developed in the foothills instead, on non-prime-agricultural land. He pushed for regional planning of the Sacramento Valley, the public interest test, and consideration of possible high-rise construction with "lots of open space." Holdstock supported the idea of regional planning and reiterated his support of the public interest test. Poulos called for requiring a certain percentage of open space in each development "to prevent anything again like Oxford Circle without any open space provision."

The Davis Improvement Association had clashed with the Council over the Lewis Homes development since the Association had been supporting the establishment of a regional waterway along Putah Creek, with a recreational greenbelt on both sides. Four of the Lewis Homes lots were along the creek which would have made the greenbelt too narrow. Although the Association was not actively supporting any candidates, members did push more general environmental issues in the campaign and helped create the ad hoc "Environmental Quality Coalition" (described below).

Other established groups such as the Junior Chamber of Commerce, the Kiwanis Club, and the Earlybird Lions Club also had forums for the candidates, with strong newspaper coverage at all these events.

NEW GROUPS

The established groups had worked primarily in communicating information. Other ad hoc groups worked to mobilize action for the campaign.

"The Voter Registration Drive" and "Get the Vote Out" were two related campus groups. The Voter Registration Drive, involving an estimated 75 students, worked primarily to register the new 18-year-old voters, as well as to encourage older students to register in Davis rather than in their home towns "because what happens in Davis affects you." After the registration deadline, they shifted their energies to promoting a bigger voter turnout.

Get the Vote Out, involving perhaps 150 students, used canvassing, offers of babysitting and rides to the polls, and information and reminders about polling places and procedures to

encourage voter turnout. This group was not primarily a pro/con growth-oriented organization but it created a larger pool of voters, adding some 6400 new voters to Davis' old total of about 10,000. And, as one of the precinct captains commented at the Clamor Club post-mortem, "probably the growth issue appealed to students most . . . that, and the new innovative ideas" such as Poulos' "consumer action" and Black's "farmers' market."

Student for Responsive City Government began in January as a "non-partisan group of students who realized that the students on this campus have a lot at stake in this election."⁵⁴ The group sent out questionnaires to each candidate concerning issues which they felt were most important to "the university community and to Davis citizens in general." Candidates' answers were later printed in the student newspaper. The group also sponsored a candidates' forum based on the issues raised in the questionnaire. At this forum, growth was one of the hottest issues with the Lewis Homes controversy being specifically debated

. . . Joan Poulos commented that contrary to the opinion of the majority of the City Council, the Lewis subdivision does not provide for the "highest and best" use of the land and that it fails to comply with the public interest test. Incumbent Miller later responded that the public interest test was a difficult one to apply in every case and that he had nine reasons for approving the Lewis subdivision Bob Black challenged Miller's belief that the development meets the public interest: "35% of the people who live in the city limits south of Interstate 80 work in Sacramento. . . . Developers should not try to lure commuters to Davis, citing Davis developer, Bill Streng as an example. Streng is known to have a toll free number for calls from Sacramento for families interested in becoming Davis-Sacramento commuters Fred Pearson sided with Miller by arguing that we should not exclude people who work in Sacramento--this would result, he maintained, in a community loss of many UCD graduates employed by the state. . . . Dick Holdstock agreed with Black and Poulos, stating that the Lewis development would deprive us of "prime agricultural land."⁵⁵

Students for Responsive City Government also sponsored a teach-in held on the main quad of the campus with growth, taxation, and housing the main topics of the two-day program.

Another, non-student, group was formed over ecological and environmental questions. The "Environmental Quality Coalition, an amalgamation of some eleven to fourteen local ecology or planning groups, sent a questionnaire of thirteen environmental concerns to the candidates. Seven of the nine responded and on the basis of their answers, the Coalition endorsed Black, Holdstock, and Poulos as the three with a "greater and more realistic concern for environmental problems."⁵⁶

The gradual organization of the Environmental Quality Coalition quite clearly follows the "four phases" pattern developed in Part Two. An interested high school teacher was the impetus for the formation.

[data source uncertain]

Tom Tomasi had gotten his list of people by going through a list of organizations and getting people very active in them and inviting them to his meeting.

This was similar to the "discovering interests" phase of Greater Davis' organization, only instead of discovering shared interests through formal conversations, the group was collected when one man decided that they had interests in common and called them together. Those who agreed that they seemed to have common interests came to the meeting and became part of the group, making the "action" decision by coming.

[field note]

Jon Hammond was saying that on Thursday Tomasi and some other people are getting together, writing a questionnaire for the candidates, we want to be sure to get our questions in it too, that's why we want to write them tonight, so we can get them to him on Thursday.

At the informal meeting held at Tomasi's house, the people he'd invited came with questions of ecological concern that they wanted the candidates to answer. Negotiation over goals (reflected in the questions) and tactics occurred.

[field note]

What sort of questions do we want? Are we trying to get more informative questions or more open-ended ones or what? . . . Questions about the leadership role of the Council, Melanie Buchanan [?] feeling that a small town could be an example, an influence, and present council hadn't been. Davis, being a University town ought to be able to "lead the way." Mary Gottlieb feeling was wrong emphasis there, you had to leave it on the city level, can't go bringing in county or national issues. . . . Tomasi: Let's figure out what we're going to do and how we're going to do it. Jon explained how the Sacramento group had done it and Mary was quite opposed to this. There was a long heated discussion on the virtues of having this group as "one" group or as a list of organizations.

Choosing a name, again, was considered very important. Various words such as "political" and "coalition" were rejected because they might have the public connotation of "dirty words." For a while, the word "politics" was defended, again in terms of future public interpretation.

[field note]

Valerie: Well, we want them to know what we stand for, we aren't hiding behind something, we want everyone to know that we're out here, willing to work for what we believe. We don't want the wishy-washy stand, want people to know that we're active, willing to work, willing to put pressure on to get what we think is necessary.

Nothing was decided for sure at this first meeting; it was just the first in a series that culminated in the name Environmental Quality Coalition and the decision to endorse candidates on the basis of their answers but not to campaign actively as a group.

Like many other action groups, the Environmental Quality Coalition used the newspaper to announce its existence to the public (phase three). It was accepted as a serious formal group in the newspaper coverage and candidates did their best to answer and return the questionnaire in the relatively brief time they were allowed. There was no need for a big membership drive--the only push for more members was in terms of "names" rather than active workers, an attempt to appear more influential for the newspaper stories.

[field note]

Val phoned and asked if I could come to Tomasi's house tonight, they want a picture showing lots of members, want all the names they can get for the reporter who's coming.

As far as solidifying in phase four, the Environmental Quality Coalition was such a short-lived group that it wouldn't have had much time to do so. As it was, it still seemed to be formalizing in some areas more than Greater Davis ever did. The group was not so clearly a friendship group as Greater Davis; it was more of an "acquaintance group." Although people were just asked to bring questions for the first meeting, some sort of task assignment developed.

[field note]

Tomasi talked then about the subcommittee to put the questions in final order, then the whole group would meet together to approve them. He asked for volunteers, he raised his own own hand. Melanie Buchanan [?] and Eileen each said they'd do it . . . [Later] Tomasi said 'on the subcommittee to write the questions, I want Valerie and John and Eileen.' Laughter and protest from Val and Jon: 'This is a military organization, you asked for volunteers!'

The main leader was definitely Tomasi, the founder, and the people he picked for the subcommittee constituted the core. This was really all that the Coalition needed to accomplish its limited objectives.

GREATER DAVIS CAMPAIGN ACTIVITY

Prior to the campaign, the Greater Davis group had been in a state of dormancy, with some worry about the visibility of the group ("We haven't been doing anything--gee, I hope we don't break up.") There was still a recognition of Bob as "their candidate":

[field note]

Hugh asked, "Well, are you connected in some way with Bob Black?" Jon: Yes, he's a member, we're supporting him for the election, good candidate.

At the same time, there was perhaps a little suspicion among the ecology wing leaders that practical exigencies might influence Bob unduly unless they were careful to ensure his continued commitment to ecological concerns.

[field note]

One question, controversial, might lose votes. Jon was saying that that was good, would make our candidates be clear and come out in the open and all; I see it as a way to "keep our candidates clean."

After the quarter break, Greater Davis held a special meeting to determine what the group should do in the campaign. Again, actions were those that individual members took in the name of the group. Roger Greensfelder wrote an article for the student newspaper as a representative of Greater Davis. Valerie and Jon spoke as members of Greater Davis at rallies on the quad. Chuck Lindner and Bob appeared at an early Clamor Club meeting to talk about growth. At the League of Women Voters debate, Jon spoke from the audience, again as a Greater Davis member.

Much of the group's campaigning, however, was done in an overlap with other groups. Val and Jon, for example, worked in the Environmental Quality Coalition; Greater Davis was thus listed in the newspaper as one of the groups comprising the Coalition. An article in the student newspaper, utilizing data gathered in their class on corporate structure, appeared under the byline, "Ecology Students for Responsive Government." Val and Jon worked with students from Malcolm Hall on a bicycle raffle and a street dance which was then held on Oxford Circle.

For the rest, however, it was mostly individual efforts (e.g., precinct work, canvassing, leaflet distribution, sign displays, and so on) *not* taken in the name of the group.

In his campaign, Bob continually emphasized his connections with Greater Davis. His promotional literature included reprints of the original news release announcing the formation of the Greater Davis group with his picture as a steering committee member. On his statement of qualifications, he included his position as one of the founders of the group.

Maurice Jackson et. al talk about the necessity for a communication network among the various groups if a movement of many small groups is to become transformed into one comprehensive social movement.⁵⁷ In Davis, although many small groups were active and many used the election as a channel for action, no big communication network developed in the sense that Jackson et. al see as critical. On the other hand, because of the interlocking memberships of the most active people⁵⁸ and because of the role of the newspaper and other intermediate structures like Clamor Club, this did not mean that communication was lacking. It did perhaps mean that no single over-arching group was formed to encompass all the various little groups. At a December potluck, some consideration was given to the idea of organizing small groups into a larger one.

[field note]

John Pamperin talked about the existence of lots of little groups though no coordination between them, might have specific things against (growth),

like the Drake Drive people, this ties in with Greater Davis' concerns, although Greater Davis is ahead of the other groups (in awareness and information) like Drake Drive. Parking is a big thing [for them], but we get together with them, see how [it] fits into ecological concerns . . . put together the little groups to form a constituency . . . having a meeting tomorrow night, getting together persons from each of the little groups, get together and talk and start finding out what they have in common.

Bob and Dick did attend the meeting the following night. Bob thought it was "interesting." Dick thought it was "a drag." No single over-arching group resulted. Yet, as mentioned above, because of the communication effects of other structures, this did not seem to harm campaign activity. [field notes]

OPPOSITION

The groups participating in the campaign, such as Students for Responsive City Government, specifically came out in favor of limiting growth. Again, the mildness of organized opposition was unusual. No new groups were formed to support growth. What opposition there was seemed to come mostly from individuals, as reflected in *Enterprise* "Letters to the Editor" such as these.

Your fine idea of stopping the growth of our community, where it lies, is analogous to the man who cuts off his hands to spite his growing nails.

May we ask, just what is wrong with urban growth between Davis and Sacramento? You knock growth and its problems, but you . . . show no alternate plans.

We seem to be in very real danger of electing to the City Council entirely one kind of councilman, the kind who are impractical dreamers. masters of cliché, innovators.⁵⁹

Even on this individual level, opposition was weak. Letters supporting the three "liberal" candidates outnumbered those attacking them. Perhaps the closest to an organized opposition was "Students to Re-Elect Councilman Miller." Co-chairmen Hugh Scaramella and [first name not known] Pon argued in ads in the *Aggie* against "slate politics" and the "politics of polarization." In a full-page ad the week before the election, they stated that "a candidate can run on his promises, a councilman must run on his record."⁶⁰ The ad then listed his record in environmental concern and planning, taxes and the student interest, and experience.

RESULTS

The results of the City Council election were overwhelming. Voter turnout was 67.5%, a record for a local election. Poulos received slightly over 8,000 votes; Holdstock, about 7,500; and Black, nearly 6,500 to sweep the election. Miller finished fourth with slightly over 3,500. Pearson and Foerster finished fifth and sixth. Although the wide margins between the top three vote-getters and the next three resulted from strong student support, the community as a whole

supported the winning slate. The results were characterized by the winners as a "mandate by the community for environmental concerns and a more active type City Council . . . a pretty strong desire on the part of the community for change."⁶¹

The fate of the various groups involved in the campaign varied depending on their goals. Some, like the Environmental Quality Coalition, which were formed specifically for the election, went out of existence after the election. Greater Davis, after its public reappearance in the campaign, went back to dormancy. It, and other groups like it, may continue in this state, reappearing to exert pressure if another issue comes up.

The successful conclusion of the City Council campaign concluded the first (incipient or "cultural confusion and social unrest"/milling) stage of the anti-growth social movement in Davis⁶² and the rudimentary organizational or "popular excitement" stage. At that point the movement supposedly had supporters in the establishment who, from their positions of power, could do something to advance longer-range goals. Possibilities included: supporting Planning Commission rejections of development plans rather than overturning their decision, encouraging zoning changes to limit possible growth, re-opening the Lewis Homes question, and starting an environmental education campaign.⁶³

In other words, in these first developing stages, the anti-growth movement won the practical tools, a share of the power, to achieve longer-term goals. The movement as a whole might (or might not) now move toward more organization and formalization, with the "transition"⁶⁴ to a coherent social movement made through the City Council/Planning Commission as spearheads, translating desires into codified statutes.

On the other hand, the problematics of existence were not yet over. With the experience of the realities of governing--such as dealing with taxes and low-income housing--City Council members might be co-opted or otherwise change their priorities. The movement might, if interested groups failed to exert continuing pressure,⁶⁵ fade away after having achieved only a preliminary success.

[Section IV on "Implications for Social Movement Models" is not included in this publication.]

NOTES

* This paper was originally titled "Dynamics of an Incipient Social Movement."

1. Davis Area Chamber of Commerce, "Growth Indicators" (mimeographed sheet), April 1972.

2. Ibid.

3. *Davis Enterprise*, December 31, 1971, p. 1. This figure includes tentative, preliminary, and final approval.

4. Abel, 1937, p. 348.

5. This possibility has been recognized in some of the social movement literature. See Maurice Jackson, et al., 1960, for a study of neighborhood groups comprising an incipient social

movement. Smelser, 1962, diagrams the different types of groups that may be involved; for example, formal, informal, spontaneous, and so on.

6. Since an "issue" is what people are against, the "issue of growth" means that people are against growth (or against too much too fast). This is a change from the usual American ethos of growth as beneficial.
7. *Davis Enterprise*, December 31, 1971, p. 1.
8. The proposal called for the City Council to immediately and as an emergency measure rezone all the undeveloped land south of I-80, west of 113, north of Covell Boulevard, and east of County Rd. 102 to interim agricultural. This 90-day period of rezoning, taken without a public hearing, would then be followed by public hearings to consider extending it for another year or until the General Plan is revised. The City should extend the freeze if this revision process takes more than a year. The City would also be empowered to revoke all building permits issued as long as actual construction had not begun. Almost all of the recently proposed or approved developments are in these areas.
9. These criteria comprise the cumulative "public interest" test:
 - Is the proposed development consistent with the stated objectives of the General Plan?
 - If so, is the development consistent with the Core Area Plan as it may apply, whether or not development is located within the core area?
 - If so, is the development consistent with the principles of the zoning ordinance?
 - If so, is the development consistent with the state legislative findings and declaration concerning open-space lands found in the Government Code at section 65561?
 - (a) If the land is used or usable for the production of food, is the conversion to urban use necessary and not premature because some conversion is required by Davis residents and workers?
 - (b) If so, are those requirements satisfied, if only partially, by the proposed development?
 - (c) If so, is the proposed conversion noncontiguous to other development, thus unnecessarily increasing the costs of community services?
 - (d) If not, is the planning Commission satisfied that there will be no significant effect on the quality of the human environment by the proposed development?
 - If the proposed development will have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, has the developer satisfied the Planning Commission that the congressional declaration of a national environmental policy (42 USC Sec. 4332) is being adhered to by his report on:
 - (a) the environmental impact of the proposed development;
 - (b) any adverse environmental effects which cannot be avoided should the development take place;
 - (c) alternatives to the proposed development;
 - (d) the relationship between local short-term uses of man's environment and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity;
 - (e) any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved in the proposed development should it take place.
10. *Enterprise*, October 28, 1971. "The primary immediate concern of the Commission will be a comprehensive analysis of the growth and development of the Davis community."

11. The composition of the committee went from a suggested 40 up to the final 100; its role from writing the plan to giving "advice and recommendations." Most of the disagreement was between Mayor [Vigfus] Asmundson and Commissioner [Gerald] Adler. This was clear at the break called during the joint meeting. As people began wandering off, Asmundson said, "Jerry, come here. If you and I agree, everyone will think it's the Planning Commission's word." By the time the break was over, a final plan had been worked out except for minor details.
12. *Enterprise*, December 7, 1971, p. 1.
13. *Enterprise*, March 29, 1972, p. 9
14. Ibid.
15. Pinard, 1969, p. 307.
16. *Enterprise*, December 2, 1971, p. 1.
17. *Enterprise*, February 17, 1972, p. 1.
18. *Enterprise*, October 29, 1971, "Letters to the Editor."
19. *Enterprise*, November 10, 1971.
20. *Enterprise*, October 27, 1971, p. 1.
21. *Enterprise*, November 2, 1971, p. 1; December 3, 1971, p. 11.
22. Pat Fulton, *Enterprise*, December 31, 1971, p. 1.
23. Abel, 1937, p. 349.
24. Ibid.
25. *California Aggie*, October 20, 1971, p. 1.
26. This process may begin with one person deciding that the others ought to be interested in this and calling them together. See Part Three.
27. See Gans, 1967, p. 56.
28. The Northwest Davis Neighborhood Association, for example, began from the consequences of a new development in their neighborhood.
29. Professor Tom, for example, at a later meeting, carried their proposal results all the way to the Federal level, although he was kidded for it.

Action isn't done on the Federal level, it starts with some guy who gets an idea, gets others interested and so it grows until they get a model, a Ford Foundation grant or something, gets watered down and eventually gets to the Federal level and then people can look at it, "Wow, isn't the Federal government liberal!" . . . Here's some small town that's *not* "radical like Berkeley," the media could get onto this, this non-radical small town says we don't want to be pushed around, organization may spread to the valley, then the region, then the governmental level. . .
30. See Part Three.
31. Blumer, 1971.
32. Anderson, et al., 1971, pp., 49-50.
33. Ibid. Reasons for preferring a small town included: concentration of large amounts of pollutants can cause health problems and damage to property; larger towns create more heat, thus increasing either discomfort or energy use; concentration of large amounts of waste can cause increase in the cost of handling; social order and public services are more difficult to maintain in large systems where people no longer feel responsible for the welfare of their community; democratic institutions function most effectively when the individual citizen can relate to the problems of his community and feel that his vote and other actions

- and inputs have some impact; the over-stimulation characteristic of large populations can cause alienation and increase the incidence of various mental and physical disorders.
34. For example, one of the leaders of the Northwest Davis group commented, "I wanted to concentrate on just traffic; we didn't have a chance with the tower--it was already built--and anyway, the students will leave in the summer and won't be there to look into their backyards--but the others wouldn't agree."
 35. On the other hand, if disagreements cannot be resolved, opposing members may simply drop out of the group. See Gans, 1967, pp. 58 & 75.
 36. This split was reflected even in descriptions of the founding of the group: those connected with the ecology wing started with the Ecology 201 paper; those in the political wing began with the 18-year-old vote or with Bob's candidacy.
 37. Gans, 1967, p. 63.
 38. Gans, 1967, p. 58.
 39. This announcement of the named group may be more or less formal. In contrast to the formal style and somewhat pompous news release adopted by the Greater Davis group, the Northwest Davis association announced its formation by a brief newspaper article stating that "a core group of northwest Davis Residents who have voiced to the council their concerns with the impact of apartment complex development on single-dwelling areas are forming [the group] to formally unify interested citizens. Two "spokesmen" for the group were quoted. Thus their public announcement still included an announcement of the formal groups, its leaders, and its purpose, but in a less formal way than the Greater Davis group.
 40. *Enterprise*, September 28, 1971.
 41. *Time* magazine, for example, pooh-poohed George McGovern's "serio-comic campaign" [which nonetheless recruited and maintained a large number of enthusiastic volunteers, especially among the young]. On the other hand, it is doubtful that a Flat Earth Society would be very successful.
 42. Jackson et al., (1960, pp. 39-40) describe one such event, a mass meeting which drew adequate numbers but, because of its ill-chosen site--a massive Coliseum that dwarfed the audience--was considered a failure. Since Greater Davis meetings are held usually in members' homes, an attendance of 20 is packed.
 43. Gerlach & Hine, 1970, pp. 183 & 188.
 44. Gerlach & Hine, 1970, p. 184: "Perceived" opposition affects the strength and growth of a movement more than "real" opposition.
 45. Jackson et al, 1960, p. 37.
 46. See Part Three, p. 57.
 47. Some negotiation of goals is healthy. But when every ten weeks or so members change their minds about the long-term goal, it is a bit too unstable for long-range accomplishments.
 48. Growth was not the only campaign issue. Groups formed and worked or were active and people voted without necessarily considering growth or [by] subordinating it to other issues such as taxes or low-cost housing. In terms of the anti-growth movement, however, growth is the only relevant issue and others will be mentioned only peripherally.
 49. Pinard, 1969, p. 309.
 50. Besides their relatively stronger positions on controlling growth, the liberal candidates also supported the Peace Initiative, a bookstore strike, more representation in city government for minorities including women and students, and Ban-the Can (Poulos vaguely). Black and

Holdstock supported the Marijuana Initiative. The three did not have identical positions but the overlap was enough to form a distinct constellation of liberal interests.

The three in the "downtown" slate were more apt to point out disadvantages from too-limited growth, Ban-the-Can, or the Peace Initiative. Miller opposed the Marijuana Initiative.

The other three candidates endorsed some positions on each side, but these six formed the opposing constellations of interests and were the six top vote-getters. As such, I will concentrate on them in my description of the campaign.

51. These included: the requirements of the community ("does not have a need for these houses at this time"); the requirements of the neighborhood ("these homes are inconsistent with the adjoining houses in that lot sizes are appreciably smaller"); the best use of the land being subdivided ("the best use of the land is agricultural"); and due regard to natural features and how they are used ("insufficient thought has been given to the Sacramento Area Regional Planning commission's plans for a green belt along Putah Creek's drainage channel").
52. *Enterprise*, March 3, 1972, p. 1.
53. Bill Drips, *California Aggie*, March 30, 1972.
54. *California Aggie*, March 29, 1972, p. 1.
55. *California Aggie*, April 3, 1972, p. 1.
56. *Enterprise*, March 30, 1972, p. 1.
57. Jackson et al., 1960, p. 37.
58. Gans, 1967, p. 64.
59. *Enterprise*, "Letters to the Editor," March 13 and April 6, 1972.
60. *California Aggie*, April 17, 1972, p. 3.
61. Quotations are from statements by Black, Poulos and Holdstock, *Enterprise*, April 12, 1972, p. 1.
62. Blumer, 1955, p. 203.
63. On April 17, 1972, the *Enterprise* carried an article on Adler's proposed series of zoning, re-zoning, and annexation-plus-pre-zoning moves which would put various land parcels into the zoned "study" category, freezing development for a year. He said the new City Council, which would presumably be more amenable to his proposals, had nothing to do with his introduction of the resolution. On June 5, 1972, the Planning commission reversed a preliminary approval of Brock's townhouse development plans, denying his request for a 99-unit first stage in the proposed 374-unit subdivision, and reasoned that "enough had changed in the last year and a half to warrant changing the City's mind."
64. Jackson et al., 1960, p. 37.
65. See "Building Freeze Ruled Out," *Davis Enterprise*, May 16, 1972, p. 1 in which Black and Adler each state publicly that he saw no further need for a planning moratorium.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Theodore, 1937. "The Pattern of a Successful Social Movement." *American Sociological Review* (June): 347-352.
- Anderson, Valerie, John Hammond, Glenn Suter and George Burns, 1971. "Davis: A Program for Today." Unpublished paper, University of California, Davis.
- Blumer, Herbert, 1971. Class Lectures. University of California, Berkeley. (Winter).
_____, 1955. "Social Movements." In *Principles of Sociology*, edited by Alfred McClung Lee. New York: Barnes & Noble, Inc.
- Davis Area Chamber of Commerce, 1972. "Growth Indicators." (April).
- Gans, Herbert J., 1967. *The Levittowners: Ways of Life and Politics in a New Suburban Community*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Gerlach, Luther & Virginia Hine, 1970. *People, Power, and Change: Movements of Social Transformation*. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Company, Inc.
- Jackson, Maurice, Eleanor Peterson, James Bull, Sverre Monsen, and Patricia Richmond, 1960. "The Failure of an Incipient Social Movement." *Pacific Sociological Review* III (Spring).
- Pinard, Maurice, 1969. "Mass Society and Political Movements: A New Formulation." pp. 306-315 in *Power, Participation, and Ideology: Readings in the Sociology of American Political Life*, edited by Calvin Larson & Philo C. Wasburn. New York: David McKay company, Inc.
- Smelser, Neil, 1962. *Theory of Collective Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Zurcher Jr., Louis, R. George Kirkpatrick, Robert G. Cushing, and Charles K. Bowman, 1971. "The Anti-Pornography Campaign: A Symbolic Crusade." *Social Problems* XIX (Fall): 217-238.